



*"Small Town Atmosphere
Outstanding Quality of Life"*

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NOTES

Meeting Date: December 1, 2010

Board Attendance: Bob Combs, Doug Farry, Randy Haberl, Renee Morgan, Jim Powers, Jim Wood

Staff Attendance: Joe Calabrigo, Kevin Gailey, Corinne Horn

411 Hartz Avenue – Danville Hotel

- Kevin Gailey, Project Planner – made a presentation to the HDRC regarding process for review and overall project description.
- Questions of parking were raised – regarding ratios of residential units to parking and the recognition of the fact that there are lifestyle choices made when you live downtown (i.e. less cars = less parking).
- Third party architect's report – response to re-submittal – suggested language which would be COA's – to allow for additional review after entitlement is secured.
- Farry suggested there should be a check in point before destruction. "Inside out" approach. COA suggestion for site-visit once it is open.
- Wood asked about fire rating requirements on the west elevation of the hotel – no.
- Wood asked about Hardy Board in new area – not on Danville Hotel. Must use real wood siding.
- Wood made comment about stucco on McCauley house – should be removed.
- Applicants brought in
- Focus on historic architect review (17 of 20 ok). Three have been translated into COA.
- Compliment versus replicate west elevation windows – replicate is the direction given.
- Garret of Castle – comfortable with conditions that require replication of windows.

510 LA GONDA WAY, DANVILLE, CALIFORNIA 94526

Administration
(925) 314-3388

Building
(925) 314-3330

Engineering & Planning
(925) 314-3310

Transportation
(925) 314-3310

Maintenance
(925) 314-3450

Police
(925) 314-3700

Parks and Recreation
(925) 314-3400

Exhibit F

- COA language to be tweaked to address if the windows which are being removed could be reused. Farry commented on window restoration. Wood commented that all windows should be consistent, whether they are reused, replicated.
- COA language to be added to address interior demo – road map of what was – once determined, return to HDRC/perform inspection with historic architect to determine best/most accurate final design. Agreed the sooner the better to not interrupt tenants.
- Castle indicated flexibility on west elevation design upon exploration prior to destruction.
- If the inspection is inconclusive, what has been shown for the west elevation will serve as a default.
- Because a restaurant use will be present, specific venting needs shall be addressed with HDRC.
- Exterior lighting – should be addressed prior to BP – should be consistent
- Signage – master sign program – should be reviewed by HDRC.
- Colors – painting – mock-ups for changes – pink on McCauley must go.
- Stucco on McCauley – recommended for removal – COA stating must return to HDRC
- Photo request for stages from Stepper to be used by museum
- Match existing with true materials – strong recommendation.
- Brick veneer – concern expressed – should be addressed prior to construction details but recommendation is for full

Decision: The HDRC approved the project and recommended the project move forward to a joint Planning Commission/Heritage Resource Commission meeting. HDRC requested the above mentioned conditions of approval be added to the final resolution to ensure final design issues are addressed.

DATE: November 18, 2010

TO: HDRC and DRB

COPY: Town Council
Joe Calabrigo, Town Manager
Steve Lake, Development Services Director
David Crompton, Principal Planner
Corinne Horn, Assistant Planner

FROM: Kevin Gailey, Chief of Planning

SUBJECT: Transmittal of Danville Hotel Plans for 12/1/10 HDRC and DRB meetings

We are forwarding copies of the most recent plans for the Danville Hotel project for your review and use.

This material is being transmitted at this time to provide HDRC and DRB additional time to familiarize themselves with the project in advance of the upcoming HDRC meeting for the project (tentatively scheduled for 4:00 pm on Wednesday, December 1, 2010 in the North Conference Room - Town Offices) and the associated DRB meeting (same date and location - with starting time tentatively scheduled for 5:30 pm).

We are forwarding the following for your review at this time:

- * Architectural Plans (dated November 12, 2010)
- * Civil Plans (dated November 11, 2010)
- * Applicant's Cover Letter (dated November 11, 2010 and accompanying DRB Checklist indicating materials available at this time)
- * Danville Hotel - Description of Historic Building Improvements (Applicant-prepared and dated October 25, 2010)
- * Updated Third Party Evaluation ("Historical Evaluation - Rehabilitation of the Danville Hotel & Danville Hotel Territories", Knapp & VerPlanck Preservation Architects, dated November 15, 2010)
- * Danville Hotel Site Development Plan Summary (updated November 17, 2010)

The electronic distribution of the HDRC/DRB packet will be supplemented with a distribution of a hard copy of the materials. Please contact Administrative Secretary Barbara Skinner by 5:00 pm Monday, November 22nd (314-3307) to indicate if you would like the hard copy of the packet delivered by regular mail or whether you would prefer to come by the Town Offices to pick up the materials in the drop box at the Town Offices.

Not included in the this transmittal is a packet of photographs of the Danville Hotel and the McCauley House that are being prepared to facilitate your review and understanding of proposed changes to these structures.

It is anticipated that the Preliminary Landscape Plan for the project will be received prior to the December 1st meeting date and will be distributed under separate cover.

Please note that while the third-party historic architect review “reads” as if it may be the initial report for the redevelopment project, this review is a follow up to the previously prepared report by the same firm (“Historical Evaluation for Site Redevelopment of Danville Hotel Territories and Danville Hotel”, Knapp Architects dated August 2008). The earlier report reviewed and commented on a prior, more aggressive redevelopment proposal for the site which included several three story elements. A copy of the earlier third-party architect report is available on request.

The current third-party report cites three guidelines among the guidelines contained in the Town of Danville *Design Guidelines for Heritage Resources* Chapter 6 – New construction that warrant special attention.

The three guidelines, and the recommendations from the historic architect, are summarized as follows:

Guideline 6.16 The architectural drawings depict use of fiber cement horizontal lapped siding for use on some portions of the exteriors for new construction. While the guidelines do not preclude use of this material, to abide with the intent of this guideline (“Horizontal lap siding should be applied in a manner similar to that seen historically”), project COAs should direct that product selected, and the manner it is installed, must have the finished appearance “relate to the lap exposure, texture and finish of traditional wood siding.”

Guideline 6.17 The architectural drawings depict extensive use of brick veneer – particularly on the first floor levels of the two new buildings. The mixed-use aspect of the project allows consideration of masonry (allowed for commercial uses not supported for residential uses). If the HDRC/DRB process allows use of brick veneer (rather than requiring use of full bricks – which is more typically the approach due to concerns about the quality and end look of brick veneers), the project COAs should be detailed so the intent of the guideline is met (“Use of masonry that appears similar in character to that seen traditionally”, specifically directing that the veneer “does not appear to be merely a veneer. In other words, it should wrap around corners in a convincing manner and avoid the placement of expansion joints in highly visible areas.”

Guideline 6.18 The architectural drawings depicts use of non-traditional materials in several areas – specifically the above-cited cement fiber board siding and the use, (particularly cornices, stringcourse, and arches) of non-traditional foam (Dryvit)-based materials. While the guidelines do not preclude use of this material, to abide with the intent of this guideline (“Other non-traditional materials are generally not appropriate, but will be considered on a case-by-case basis.”), project COAs should direct that product(s) selected, and the manner it is (they are) installed, must “appear similar in scale, proportion, texture, and finish to those used traditionally.”

Related concerns are voiced in the third party review about fenestration, acknowledging that traditional storefronts were made of either wood or metal with tiled bulkheads. For residential properties, the traditional approach was to have windows that were typically double-hung and wooden in construction. The project COAs should be structured to direct that "the materials used for both commercial and residential fenestration be made of comparable (traditional) materials." The report states that use of vinyl windows with imitation mullions and muntins sandwiched between the panes should be considered inappropriate (i.e., should be disallowed).

We will be following up this transmittal with a separate memorandum describing the review processed proposed for us with this project. As has been previously indicated, the review process for the Danville Hotel project is planned to be a tiered review, with many of the architectural details reviewed in between the time the project receives its planning entitlement approval and the preparation of plans for building permit review.

Questions pertaining to this packet, or the project in general, may be directed to my attention at your convenience.

Kevin Gailey
Chief of Planning

Phone: (925) 314-3305
Email: kgailey@danville.ca.gov